EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

IN REPLY REFER TO:

CC 92-77

September 16, 1994

RECEIVED

SEP 2 2 1994

The Honorable E (Kika) de la Garza U.S. House of Representatives 1401 Longorth House Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Congressman de la Garza:

Thank you for your letter on behalf of Leroy Moody, Sheriff, San Patricio County, regarding the Commission's Billed Party Preference (BPP) proceeding. On May 19, 1994, the Commission adopted a <u>Further Notice</u> of <u>Proposed Rulemaking</u> in this proceeding. I have enclosed a copy of the <u>Further Notice</u> and press release accompanying it for your information.

The <u>Further Notice</u> sets forth a detailed cost/benefit analysis of BPP. This analysis indicates, based on the available data, that the benefits of BPP to consumers would exceed its costs. The <u>Further Notice</u> seeks comment on this analysis and asks interested parties to supplement the record concerning the costs and benefits of BPP. The <u>Further Notice</u> also invites parties to recommend alternatives to BPP that could produce many of the same benefits at a lower cost.

The <u>Further Notice</u> also explicitly seeks comment on whether correctional facility telephones should be exempt if BPP is adopted. Specifically, the <u>Further Notice</u> seeks additional information on the effectiveness and costs of controlling fraud originating on inmate lines with or without BPP. The <u>Further Notice</u> also seeks comment on a proposal to exempt prison telephones from BPP if the operator service provider adheres to rate ceilings for inmate calling services.

BPP would not preclude prison officials from blocking or limiting inmate calls to specific telephone numbers in order to prevent threatening and harassing calls. Moreover, BPP would not affect the ability of prison officials to limit inmates to collect calling or to program telephone equipment at the prison site to block certain numbers.

No. of Copies rec'd_ List ABCDE The Honorable E (Kika) de la Garza Page 2

Thank you for your interest in this proceeding. I can assure you that the Commission will carefully examine all of the comments submitted in response to the <u>Further Notice</u>, including additional empirical data regarding the costs and benefits of implementing BPP and the impact of BPP on telephone service from correctional facilities.

Sincerely yours,

Kathleen M.H. Wallman

Chief

Common Carrier Bureau

Enclosures

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Mashington, DC 20515-4315

August 11, 1994

Ms Judy Harris Director Office of Legislative Affairs Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N W Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Ms Harris

Re: Leroy Moody

San Patricio County Sheriff

Sinton, TX 78387

The attached is being submitted to you for whatever consideration you can give the situation commensurate with your policies.

I'll look forward to hearing from you -- and with my always high regards, I am

Sincerely,

E (Kika) de la Garza, M C

bet Enclosures



LEROY MOODY

SHERIFF

Phone 364-2251 Area Code 512 Post Office Box 1382 SINTON, TX 78387-1382



July 28, 1994

Federal Communications Commission FCC Secretary's Office 1919 M Street, NW Room 222 Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Sirs:

In reference to the purposed Billed Party Preference for 0+ interLATA calls, the San Patricio County Sheriff's Department is opposed to this change due to the following facts:

- 1. Lose blocking control of phones to prevent harassment of victims and witnesses.
- Loss of revenue for counties and an increase in cost for the inmate's family
- 3. Loss of control of phone use and call duration.

There are other questions about this change and concerns about who will pay for this. We oppose the BPP and encourage the FCC to do the same.

Sincerely,

Leroy Moody

LM/js

cc: Vice-President Al Gore

The Honorable Kika de la Garza

The Honorable Phil Gramm